UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/970,600	10/04/2001	William H. Wisecarver III	1480-R-00	1951
	7590 01/30/200 DLA PIPER US LLP	EXAMINER		
ONE LIBERTY		DASS, HARISH T		
PHILADELPH	F ST, SUITE 4900 IA, PA 19103		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3692	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/970,600	WISECARVER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	Harish I. Dass	3692	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 January 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appefor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Claperiods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing.	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	lvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	) <u>.</u>		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the state forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on tension and the corresponding amount of the contract of the correct of t	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compli	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wit AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	ut prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con	· ·		
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
<ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or</li></ul>	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		Sanat Madanasa adam	. ( P (I
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	·	•	_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	co bocauso:
See Continuation Sheet.		CONDITION TO Allowall	ce because.
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (I	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
/Harish T Dass/	Harish T Dass		
(1-28-08)	Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3692		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see paper number 20071029 and response to applicant's arguments, see bellow.

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant's arguments filed 1/9/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Note: The examiner response is limited to claimed limitation only (excludes any language that is not claimed e.g., "gatekeeper", etc).

The Examiner has reviewed applicant's arguments in light of the applicant's original disclosure, and broadest reasonable interpretation of the claimed limitation and prior arts of record.

In response to applicant's argument for rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, this rejection is maintained, because:

In case of "data account", the examiner is not satisfied by the applicant's explanation. A review of applicant's specification clearly does not discloses the "data account".

In case of "executing" is not sufficiently described but then later states that executing is supported.

The office action (paper No. 20071029) page 2 reads "Examiner is unable to find support for these limitations, in case of "executing" examiner assumes applicant is referring to "performing procedures for on-line purchasing." Applicant has not acknowledged acceptance or rejection of the examiner's assumption. The applicant's remarks suggest that the examiner's rejection of "executing" is contradictory. If applicant accepts the examiner assumption, it should be clearly stated and the rejection of "executing" will be removed.

In response to applicant's argument that prior art of record failed to disclose "data account". The examiner disagrees with the applicant's argument and analysis, because:

The characterization of an account as "data account" as stated in the independent claim 1 (argued as distinguished data) is not a patentable distinct from account disclosed by prior arts of record.

See the original specification page 2 which reads, "In this embodiment, payment security between consumers and vendors can be maintained through use of an on-line Stored Value Lock Box (SVLB). Consumers can credit or "fill" their SVLB through any of a variety of available mechanisms, such as by phone, mail or the Internet. A system provider then contacts the consumers' credit card issuing bank preferably electronically and receives authorization for the credit amount. Maximum amounts for the SVLB account can be established at any time, such as when the account is opened by the consumer, and also the amount may be updated. When the SVLB account is filled." which points to an account with value as it disclosed in prior arts of record.